DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 474 CE 019 502

AUTHOR Samet, Carolyn; Wright, Jerauld B.
TITLE Local Advisory Councils on Vocational Education in North Carolina: A Profile.
INSTITUTION North Carolina State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Raleigh.
PUB DATE 17 Nov 78
NOTE 34p.; For related documents see CE 019 500-503

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; Age; Community Colleges; Federal Regulation; Group Membership; Leadership Responsibility; Occupational Information; *Participant Characteristics; Postsecondary Education; *Program Planning; Public Schools; *Questionnaires; Racial Composition; Reports; Research Projects; *Role Perception; Secondary Education; Sex (Characteristics); State Boards of Education; *State Surveys; Surveys; Technical Institutes; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina; United States; Vocational Education Amendments

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to (1) review state board of education procedures used in assuring that local advisory councils (LACs) are being used in preparing local plans; (2) develop a profile of LACs created to advise on 1978 plans; and (3) discover how LACs regard their role in local plan development for North Carolina vocational education in local schools (145 units) and community colleges/technical institutes (57 colleges). In a survey of LAC members 886 out of 1880 questionnaires were returned. The study concluded that the state board of education did require local recipients annual applications to show that a LAC has been established. A LAC profile revealed overrepresentation by white males and members of the education profession and underrepresentation of those under twenty-five. Most LAC members felt their primary role was to develop the local application and to provide information on local industrial needs. It is recommended that appointments to LACs should show more concern for race/sex/age composition, orient members to their expected role, include a membership representative of trades/professions taught in vocational programs, and balance membership between educational professionals and other professionals. (Appendixes contain assurance of advisory committee forms and LAC survey materials.) (CSS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170474

LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS on VOCATIONAL EDUCATION in NORTH CAROLINA: A PROFILE

by

Carolyn Samet
Special Assistant

and

J. B. Wright
Research and Evaluation Consultant

for the

State Advisory Council on Education
P.O. Box 5312
Raleigh, NC 27650

Adopted by The State Advisory Council
on
November 17, 1978

CE 019 502

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Michael Latta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The State Advisory Council on Education sincerely appreciates the assistance and cooperation which staff members of the State Board of Education, particularly Ken Oleson of the Department of Community Colleges and Bill McClure of the Department of Public Instruction, gave during this study. We also want to thank the Local Directors of Vocational Education in North Carolina's public school system and the Deans of Instruction at the various community colleges/technical institutes, who provided information about how to contact Local Advisory Council members across the State.

INTRODUCTION

The Education Amendments of 1976 require that a local advisory council on vocational education be established by each eligible recipient receiving assistance under the Act. This law also requires that each state advisory council (SAC) provide technical assistance in how to establish and operate local advisory councils (LACs) when requested by a local education agency (LEA). In North Carolina, the "state advisory council" is the State Advisory Council on Education, and the 145 public school administrative units and 57 community colleges/technical institutes are the local educational agencies (LEAs).

The purpose of LACs is to advise local education officials on current job needs and on the relevancy of courses being offered by their school. Federal regulations require that LAC membership include representatives of the general public, especially of business, industry, and labor. In addition, each LAC is to have "an appropriate representation of both sexes and an appropriate representation of the racial and ethnic minorities found in the program areas, schools, community, or region which the local advisory council serves."[1]

The State Board of Education has to assure the U. S. Commissioner of Education that federal funds are distributed to eligible recipients on the basis of applications which have been developed in consultation with such councils.[2] In order to show the U. S. Commissioner that these councils exist, the State Board requires that annual applications for funding submitted by

---

[1] The Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 191 (Oct. 3, 1977), p. 53833.

[2] Title II, P.L. 94-482, Section 106(a)(4), as amended.

each local educational agency include a list of the local advisory council's membership. Appendix A and Appendix B contain copies of the forms which LEAs used to supply this information.

REASONS FOR THIS STUDY

This study was conducted for three reasons:

1. To review the procedures used by the State Board of Education in assuring that LACs are being used in preparing local plans;
2. To develop a profile of the local advisory councils created to advise on FY 1978 local plans; and
3. To find out what LAC members think about the part they have played in the development of local plans for vocational education in their local schools and community colleges/technical institutes.

PROCEDURE

The procedure followed during the study was:

1. Names of LAC members were obtained by copying that page from the local plan which each LEA (57 community colleges plus 145 public school units) had filed with the State Board of Education.
2. Mailing addresses of LAC members were obtained. For all but 26 of the public school units, these mailing addresses were available in the local plan. None of the 57 plans for LEAs in the Community College System carried LAC members' mailing addresses. All 83 of

these LEAs were sent a list of their LAC members copied from their own local plan, with a request for proper mailing addresses. This survey provided mailing addresses for LAC members of 56 (98 percent) of the 57 Community Colleges and Technical Institutes, and 139 (96 percent) of the 145 public school units.

3. Questionnaires were mailed to all of the LAC members whose mailing addresses were available. (Appendix C contains the complete package of materials mailed to LAC members.) A second set of materials was sent to all LAC members who had not responded in three weeks.

   Results of the survey were:

Questionnaires mailed to LAC members	1908
Returned due to incorrect address	28
TOTAL	1880
Total questionnaires returned by LAC members	886 (47%)
Questionnaires returned with the comment "not applicable to me" (15% of those returned)	135
Adjusted total (usable questionnaires returned)	751 (40%)[3]

4. Returns from the survey were analyzed.

5. The final step was the preparation and distribution of this report.

---

[3]It should be noted that the response rate from community colleges/technical institute local advisory committee members was much greater (53 percent) than from public school units (34 percent). Reasons for this are unknown. Twenty-six (26) completed questionnaires were returned from individuals who indicated they were serving on LACs for both a public school unit and a community college/technical institute. If this number is added to the returns for each type of LEA, the response rates can be adjusted to 36 percent for public school units and 59 percent for CC/TIs.

REVIEW OF STATE BOARD COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES

Certification that local advisory councils were created and involved in the preparation of local applications was handled differently by the Department of Community Colleges and the Department of Public Instruction. In the Community College System, the certification requirement was satisfied by having the institution's president and each LAC member sign the first page of the Local Application for Federal Funds.

For the 145 public school units, the local school board chairman and the superintendent of schools both signed a certification statement, and the LAC members' names were listed on page 2 of the Local Application for Federal Funds. Utilization of LACs by public school units was further documented in Part G of the application and through on-site reviews of local plans by state staff members.

Neither the Department of Public Instruction nor the Department of Community Colleges required the race/sex breakdown of LAC members, but occupations or areas of representation were requested by both departments. Neither department rejected an LEA's application for funding for not involving a local advisory committee.[4]

Quality of Compliance

This survey established that in some LEAs local advisory committees are "alive and well." LAC members in these school units are enthusiastic about what the committee has accomplished and about having been asked to help make decisions in matters that are important to the school and to occupational/vocational programs.

---

[4]One public school LEA did not provide a list of LAC members on its local application. A State Department of Public Instruction official explained that local officials were in the process of establishing the LAC. He was satisfied that the LAC would be consulted in implementing the 1978 local plan and in reviewing the curriculum. He was thus satisfied that the LEA would satisfy the intent of the law.

Like many surveys, this one also yielded useful information by some of the data it did not provide. For example, the low response rate (40%) may suggest that the majority of people who are serving on LACs across the State (the 60% who didn't respond) don't think it is a very important or prestigious position. At least it is reasonable to assume that if they did think so, they would have responded!

LAC membership rosters sent to the State Board of Education with the 1978 local plans were not always accurate. It must be noted that some of the LAC membership rosters obtained directly from public school units and community colleges/technical institutes inadvertently included the names of LAC members who would be involved in the preparation of the FY 1979 local plan. These names were deleted from the survey when they could be identified.

The evidence suggests that school officials in some LEAs never intended to involve the LAC they appointed in anything important and that some school officials knowingly violated the requirements of vocational education programs by certifying that LACs had been appointed when, in fact, they had not. Other conclusions do not adequately explain the large number of questionnaires (15 percent of all returns) that came back with the notation that the survey was "not applicable." It does not seem possible that an LAC member could have been meaningfully involved in planning and then not know that this LAC survey pertained to members of LACs such as the one he had served on.

The members of some LACs hadn't been told enough about what LACs are expected to do. Approximately twenty (20) of the respondents enclosed a note or wrote a comment on the questionnaire saying that they had been asked to serve on a local advisory council but were never again contacted about a

meeting. Others stated they had been appointed so recently that they had not yet had a chance to serve.[5]

PROFILE OF LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

It is not possible to construct an accurate image of the "average" LAC in North Carolina, primarily because there is too much difference in the average size of public school and community college LACs. In public schools the average number of members per LAC is 10.8 (See Table 1). For community colleges the average number of members is 7.8 (see Table 2).

Table 1. Number of Members of LACs (Public Schools)

Number of members	Frequency	%
0	1	.7
2-3	1	.7
4-5	8	5.7
6-7	27	19.3
8-9	33	23.6
10-11	21	15.0
12-13	15	10.7
14-15	11	7.9
16+	23	16.4
TOTALS	140*	100.0

Total Public School LAC Members = 1,518
Mean No. of Members per LAC = 10.8

*Does not total 145 because 5 LACs were representative of combined LEA units.

However, a fairly accurate image of the "average" LAC member can be drawn. He would be a white male (only one chance in five of being female,

[5]Some of the respondents' comments explaining why the questionnaires were "not applicable" to them are presented in Appendix D.

and less than one chance in ten of being black). His age would be between 35 and 55 (about one chance in five of being either younger or older). (See Table 7). And there is a 65 percent to 75 percent chance he would be a representative of business, industry, or education. There is little more than one chance in twenty that he would represent organized labor.

Table 2. Number of Members of LACs (CC/TIs)

Number of Members	Frequency	%
2-3	0	0.0
4-5	15	26.3
6-7	14	24.6
8-9	12	21.1
10-11	8	14.0
12-13	6	10.5
14-15	2	3.5
16+	0	0.0
TOTALS	57	100.00

Total CC/TI LAC Members = 445
Mean No. of Members per LAC = 7.8

The Rules and Regulations for implementing Title II of Public Law 94-482 state that local advisory councils should consist of appropriate representation from the community or region in terms of race and sex. Overall, North Carolina's population is broken down racially and sexually as seen in Table 3. Table 4 shows that when compared with the race/sex breakdown of North Carolina's entire population, membership on LACs is heavily skewed toward white males.

Table 3. Race/Sex Breakdown of N. C. Population (1976)

Sex	White	Non-white	Totals
Male	37.5% (2,049,129)	11.1% (609,781)	48.6% (2,658,910)
Female	39.1 (2,138,216)	12.3 (671,955)	51.4 (2,810,171)
TOTALS	76.6 (4,187,345)	23.4 (1,281,736)	100.0 (5,469,081)

Source: N C. Dept. of Administration, Div. of Budget & Management

Table 4. Race/Sex Breakdown of LAC Memberships Overall

Race	Male	Female	No Answer	Totals
White	70.0% (527)	19.3% (145)	.5% (4)	89.8% (676)
Black	6.2 (47)	.7 (5)	.1 (1)	7.0 (53)
American Indian	.8 (6)	.3 (2)	--	1.0 (8)
Other	.1 (1)	--	--	.1 (1)
No Answer	.1 (1)	.5 (4)	1.3 (10)	2.0 (15)
TOTALS	77.2 (582)	20.8 (156)	1.9 (15)	99.9* (753)

*Does not total 100.0 percent due to rounding.

Tables 5 and 6 show the race/sex distribution of public school LACs and community college LACs, respectively. Representation by non-whites and females at both levels is unquestionably short compared to their distribution in the population.

The North Carolina Commission on Indian Affairs reports that there are approximately 50,000 Indians in the State, which is approximately one percent of the State's total population. Overall LAC membership consists of one percent American Indians so it appears that for the State as a whole this racial group is adequately represented on LACs.

Among LAC memberships there is limited representation from the under-25 age group (See Table 7). Although age is not a factor in the LAC memberships

Table 5. Race/Sex Breakdown of Public School Unit LACs

Race	Male	Female	No Answer	Totals
White	68.1% (340)	19.6% (98)	.4% (2)	88.2% (440)
Black	8.0 (40)	.6 (3)	.2 (1)	8.8 (44)
American Indian	.4 (2)	.2 (1)	--	.6 (3)
Other	.2 (1)	--	--	.2 (1)
No Answer	--	.8 (4)	1.4 (7)	2.2 (11)
TOTALS	76.8 (383)	21.2 (106)	2.0 (10)	100.0 (499)

Table 6. Race/Sex Breakdown of Community College/Technical Institute LACs

Race	Male	Female	No Answer	Totals
White	74.6% (170)	17.5% (40)	.9% (2)	93.0% (212)
Black	2.6 (6)	.9 (2)	--	3.5 (8)
American Indian	1.8 (4)	--	--	1.8 (4)
Other	--	--	--	--
No Answer	.4 (1)	--	1.3 (3)	1.8 (4)
TOTALS	79.4 (181)	18.4 (42)	2.2 (5)	100.0* (228)

Table 7. Age Breakdown of LAC Members

Age	Percent of LAC Members
Less than 18	.4% (3)
18 to 25	1.9 (14)
26 to 35	15.1 (114)
36 to 45	28.2 (212)
46 to 55	34.1 (257)
56 to 64	15.1 (114)
65+	3.7 (28)
No Answer	1.7 (11)
TOTALS	100.2* (753)

*Totals more than 100.0% due to rounding.

recommended by the federal regulations, younger people should be considered among LAC members if one considers the age of most students enrolled in vocational programs. In 1975, secondary enrollment in vocational programs totaled about 53.6 percent of the State's population aged 15-19. Post-secondary enrollment included about 17.7 percent of people aged 20-24 and about 10.1 percent of the adult population (25-64).

It can be reasonably argued that people over 25 years of age have had more experience in the world of work and, therefore, have more of the expertise and knowledge needed by members of local advisory committees. However, it can also be argued that younger persons should have more voice in planning vocational programs because they comprise most of the student population.

Table 8 reveals fairly ample representation on LACs from business and industry--nearly half of LAC memberships (combined percentage of 44.6 percent). Labor appears at first to be underrepresented (3.2 percent). But if the definition of "labor" is construed to mean "organized labor," then the low percentage may be somewhat justified in North Carolina. If "labor" means representatives of blue-collar trades, then representation from this category is, indeed, inadequate.

Federal law does not specifically address representation on LACs by educators. However, the 22.7 percent overall representation by educators, which is greater than industrial representation or general public representation (including "Other"), seems somewhat more than adequate.

Appointing Authority

It is generally accepted that proper appointment procedures are necessary if an advisory committee is to have enough dignity and status to make people want to serve. Appointment by the chief administrative officer of the

Table 8. LAC Members' Area of Representation by Type of LEA

Area of representation	Public school units	Community colleges/ technical institutes	Overall
Business	29.7% (148)	23.3% (53)	27.2% (205)
Industry	14.0 (70)	23.3 (53)	17.3 (130)
Labor	2.0 (10)	5.7 (13)	3.2 (24)
Student	5.6 (28)	.9 (2)	4.1 (31)
Government	5.2 (26)	.4 (1)	4.3 (32)
Education	21.0 (105)	27.6 (63)	22.7 (171)
Public	4.4 (22)	4.8 (11)	4.4 (33)
Other	13.6 (68)	10.9 (25)	13.0 (98)
Don't know	4.4 (22)	3.0 (7)	3.9 (29)
TOTALS	99.9* (499)	99.9* (228)	100.1* (753)

*Percentages do not total 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 9. LAC Appointing Authority by Type of LEA

Appointing Authority	Public school units	Community colleges/ Technical Institutes
Superintendent	28.3% (141)	5.3% (12)
Principal	9.0 (45)	.4 (1)
Local Director of Vocational Education	42.3 (211)	40.8 (93)
CC/TI President	.4 (2)	23.3 (53)
CC/TI Dean	.2 (1)	8.8 (20)
Appointed by 2 Authorities*	1.8 (9)	.4 (1)
Appointed by Board of Education	8.6 (43)	.9 (2)
Other	8.0 (40)	17.1 (39)
No Answer	1.4 (7)	3.0 (7)
TOTALS	100.0 (499)	100.0 (228)

*Respondents checked 2 authorities on questionnaire.

LEA carries more of a sense of purpose and status than appointment by a "lower" official. As shown in Table 9, less than a third of all advisory committees, at either secondary or post-secondary level, were appointed by the chief administrative officer.

Length of Service

Local advisory councils were first mandated by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. In order to determine whether LEAs were using LACs before they were required, respondents were asked the original date of their appointment. Nearly half (48.8 percent) of LAC members for public school LEAs had served on their councils for one year or more, revealing that many secondary level LEAs had established LACs before they were required by law.

Encouragement in the use of unitwide LACs in the public schools can be officially documented as far back as 1971 when the occupational education program planning guide for secondary school local planners specifically suggested a "consultant/advisory committee" as part of the local planning team.[6] The guide's description of the committee's composition and functions closely parallels that of the 1976 Amendments:

> Members should be representative of the business, industrial and agricultural communities, and be persons who are knowledgeable of the labor market needs. Representatives from the local employment office, Chamber of Commerce, and Economic Development Council might be included. The need for articulation of secondary and post-secondary occupational education programs suggests representation from the community college or technical institute serving the community. The primary functions of the Committee are to supply labor market data, help analyze these data in terms of programs provided, and react to the proposed plan.[7]

---

[6] Program Planning Guide, Occupational Education: A Handbook for Local Planners, Secondary Schools (Raleigh: Dept. of Public Instruction, 1971), p. 2.

[7] Ibid.

Similar recommendations have been made every year since 1971, and the data show that the recommendations have had some effect. Some respondents (9.6 percent) have served on public school LACs for as long as five or more years (see Table 10). Table 10 also shows that slightly more than half (52.6 percent) of LAC members for CC/TI had served on their councils for less than one year.

Prior to the Vocational Education Act of 1976, unitwide local advisory councils were not required in the Community College System. However, Table 10 indicates that nearly one-third (32.8 percent) of CC/TI LAC members said they had served on such councils for one year or more. This discrepancy may be due to a misunderstanding as to the difference between unitwide LACs and program area advisory committees. CC/TI officials noted that the more specialized program area committees have been used by the individual campuses for years.

Table 10. Length of Service on LACs by Type of LEA

Length of Service	Public School Units	Community Colleges/ Technical Institutes
Less than 1 year	38.9% (194)	52.6% (120)
1 year	9.0 (45)	9.7 (22)
2 years	18.4 (92)	8.3 (19)
3 years	7.8 (39)	4.8 (11)
4 years	4.0 (20)	3.0 (7)
5+	9.6 (48)	7.0 (16)
Don't know	12.2 (61)	14.5 (33)
TOTALS	99.9* (499)	99.9* (228)

*Does not total 100.0% due to rounding.

PERCEPTIONS OF LAC MEMBERS

The third reason for this study was to find out what LAC members think about the roles they have played in the planning process. Respondents were asked what the LEA did with their advice. They were asked whether their council had met for other purposes besides planning and, if so, what those purposes were. Respondents were asked to define their role as a local advisory council, and they were asked how they felt about their roles as advisers on industrial needs in their community.

Responses to the first question showed that LAC members are not very well satisfied with the use their LEA makes of Council advice (see Table 11). Only a third of the public school respondents felt that council advice was used to the fullest extent, although members of post-secondary LACs seemed somewhat more pleased. Table 11 shows that 40.8 percent of CC/TI LAC members felt their advice had been used to the fullest extent. The greater satisfaction of CC/TI LAC members may stem from the fact that unitwide CC/TI LACs have not been in existence as long as unitwide councils for public schools so their members may still feel too insecure to express negative feelings. Also, CC/TI LACs are somewhat smaller. Members may feel closer to the planning process and may feel more confident that their advice brought about some changes.

Table 11. Members' Perceptions of Use of LAC Advice by Type of LEA

How used	Public school units	Community colleges/ Technical Institutes	Overall
Fullest extent	33.0% (165)	40.8% (93)	35.0% (264)
Could be better utilized	28.4 (142)	23.3 (53)	26.7 (201)
Has been largely ignored	3.2 (16)	2.6 (6)	3.0 (23)
Not requested	11.2 (56)	12.7 (29)	11.9 (89)
Cannot answer	4.2 (21)	6.6 (15)	4.8 (36)
Don't know	19.8 (99)	14.0 (32)	18.6 (140)
TOTALS	99.9* (499)	100.0 (228)	100.0 (753)

*Does not total 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 12 shows that just over half of the LAC members said that their councils had met for purposes other than advising on the development of the local application. There were few differences in purposes for these meetings at the two levels (see Table 13). Respondents said they had met for the following "other" reasons: to review/plan the vocational education curriculum; to discuss a specific subject; to conduct a regular business session scheduled at regular, periodic intervals; to discuss the local plan; to discuss the types of courses needed for the particular training program; and for miscellaneous reasons.

One significant difference between responses from public schools and CC/TIs was that public school LACs tended to follow a more regular meeting schedule. Again, since many public school LACs have been in existence longer, they probably have established a more dependable routine and more regular procedures. It is surprising, however, that LACs which had followed a more regular meeting schedule did not seem any more satisfied about the use made of their advice.

Table 12. "Other" Use of LACs by Type of LEA

Whether "Other" Uses	Public School Units	Community colleges/ Technical Institutes	Overall
Yes	57.5% (287)	36.4% (83)	50.9% (370)
No	35.0 (175)	53.5 (122)	40.8 (297)
Can't Answer	2.6 (13)	6.1 (14)	3.7 (27)
Don't Know	4.8 (24)	3.9 (9)	4.5 (33)
TOTALS	99.9* (499)	99.9* (228)	99.9* (727)

*Does not total 100.0% due to rounding.

When asked what they believed the role of a local advisory council was, exclusive of the development of the annual application, respondents from both

levels gave the same replies. The responses corresponded closely to the "other" purposes for which the LACs had met. Primary reactions included involvement in curriculum development/planning; giving advice on local industrial needs; public relations activities between the LEA and area industry; evaluating existing programs and following up on graduates of these programs; giving "just general" advice on whatever subject may be referred to the Council; and miscellaneous other roles. At both levels, members felt they should be advising on local industrial needs so that appropriate courses could be provided in the curriculum (see Tables 13 and 14 which show that members' perceptions about proper roles for LACs were considerably different from their perceptions of what they had actually done at LAC meetings). Also, members' perceptions of the stated purpose for LAC meetings differed from the outcomes which they perceived for the meetings.

Much of the data about perceived and observed roles for LAC members appears to relate back to the issue discussed on pages 5 and 6; namely, how well LAC members and educators are communicating with each other. The "other" reasons for which these respondents said their LAC had met appear to correspond quite well with the tasks, uses, purposes, and activities which they perceived for LACs; but some of the respondents didn't think their LAC had been doing these important things.

LAC members believe they can have an important role as advisers on local industrial needs, as shown by responses to the question: "How do you think your council can assist the local education agency in making vocational education courses be more responsive to area industrial needs?" Table 15 shows that over one-third of all LAC members thought their council could provide such assistance through assessing the needs of local business and industry. (Presumably, these "needs" are related to personnel training.) Two-thirds of the respondents gave usable and appropriate answers to this question.

Table 13. Types of "Other" Purposes for Which LACs Had Met by Type of LEA

Types of Uses	Public School Units	Community Colleges/ Technical Institutes
Review/plan curriculum	11.6% (58)	10.5% (24)
Discuss specific subject	9.6 (48)	4.8 (11)
Conduct regular business	22.4 (112)	9.6 (22)
Local plan	.6 (3)	.4 (1)
Needed courses	5.2 (26)	7.4 (17)
Miscellaneous	4.4 (22)	2.1 (5)
Answer not required	37.2 (186)	59.6 (136)
Don't know	8.8 (44)	5.2 (12)
TOTALS	99.8* (499)	99.6* (228)

*Does not total 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 14. Members' Perceptions of Proper Role for LAC by Type of LEA

Role	Public School Units	Community Colleges/ Technical Institutes	Overall
Curriculum dev./ planning	10.6% (53)	14.5% (32)	12.0% (91)
Local industrial needs, info.	29.0 (145)	36.4 (83)	30.9 (233)
Public relations-LEA/area industry	8.6 (43)	6.6 (15)	8.0 (60)
Evaluation of programs	5.0 (25)	5.3 (12)	5.0 (38)
General advice	9.2 (46)	4.8 (11)	7.7 (58)
Miscellaneous	10.9 (54)	7.5 (17)	9.8 (74)
Answer inappropriate	1.0 (5)	1.3 (3)	1.0 (8)
Don't know; no answer	25.7 (128)	24.1 (55)	25.4 (191)

*Does not total 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 15. LAC Members' Perceptions of Role in LEA Training Responsiveness

Role	Public school units	Community Colleges/ Technical Institutes	Overall
Communication	11.6% (58)	10.1% (23)	11.2% (84)
Assessment of needs	37.7 (188)	38.1 (87)	37.3 (281)
Involvement	4.8 (24)	6.1 (14)	5.4 (41)
Resource persons	2.2 (11)	.4 (1)	1.6 (12)
Miscellaneous	14.4 (72)	11.8 (27)	13.4 (101)
Inappropriate answer	4.2 (21)	5.3 (12)	4.5 (34)
Don't know	25.0 (125)	28.1 (64)	26.6 (200)
TOTALS	99.9* (499)	99.9* (228)	100.0 (753)

*Does not total 100.0% due to rounding.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The State Board of Education did comply with federal law by requiring that annual applications from local recipients show that a local advisory committee had been established. At both levels, the LEA had to verify that the LAC had been consulted during preparation of the local application. However, compliance procedures were different for the Department of Public Instruction and the Department of Community Colleges.

Local advisory committees for public school units were somewhat larger (10.8 members) than those for community colleges/technical institutes (7.8 members). LACs at both levels were heavily overrepresented by white males, with females noticeably underrepresented and blacks seriously underrepresented. American Indians were apparently represented fairly well in proportion to their population in the State.

Average age of LAC members is well above the average age of the general population. People under the age of 25 are seriously underrepresented on LACs compared to their numbers in the general population.

Advisory committee structures are quite fairly representative of the general public, with the largest concentration of members at both the public school and CC/TI levels being from business and industry. The field of education is probably overrepresented on LACs, with approximately one-fourth of all LAC memberships.

Most LAC members at both levels were appointed by the local director of vocational education. A surprisingly high percentage (half) of members of both public school and CC/TI LACs had served on their councils for one or more years.

Council members had mixed feelings about the use their LEA made of LAC advice. Meetings were called for purposes other than advice on the local plan in over half of the public school units, and in about one-third of the CC/TI LACs. Although reasons for these additional meetings varied, most stemmed from the need to hold regular business sessions, at least at the public school level. There seemed to be no consistent reason for holding "other" meetings in the community colleges/technical institutes. At both levels, a plurality of members felt their primary role, other than in the development of the local application, was in providing the LEA with information on local industrial needs.

The local advisory council system in North Carolina is not in the best of health following its first year of operation under the Education Amendments of 1976. However, the data show there has been a good beginning. In subsequent years, appointments to LACs should show more concern for:

1. Race/sex/age composition.
2. Proper orientation of LAC members to the role expected of the Council.

3. Having LAC membership be representative of the trades/professions being taught in the schools' vocational programs.
4. Proper balance in LAC membership between the educational profession and all other professions.

FOR A FREE BOOKLET ENTITLED
"CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS: A HANDBOOK,"
WRITE TO:

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
P. O. BOX 5312
RALEIGH, NC 27650

APPENDIX A

ASSURANCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FORM USED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL LEAs

2. LEA Unit-Wide Occupational Education Advisory Committee

Name	Occupation[2/]

2/ Individual(s) representing consumer interests and parenting responsibilities should be included on the LEA Unit-Wide Occupational Education Advisory Committee. It is further recommended that at least five (5) different occupations be represented on this Committee.

APPENDIX B

ASSURANCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE FORM

USED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTITUTIONS

PART II - Local Advisory Council - Advice for Local Job Needs and Course Relevancy

Public Law 94-482, Section 106 (a) (4) (A) (ii) requires that local applications be developed in consultation (ii) "with the local advisory council required to be established by this Act to assist such recipients." (Section 105 [g][1] Composition of Council).

CERTIFICATION:

I have served as a member of the local advisory council on vocational education for _____, and
institution
have provided advice to the institution regarding the relevancy for the programs offered or proposed and current job need in this area.

SIGNATURE	REPRESENTING	DATE

APPENDIX C

SURVEY MATERIALS MAILED TO LAC MEMBERS

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PHILLIP O. BERRY
CHAIRMAN

P. O. BOX 5312
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27607
(919) 737-2495

E. MICHAEL LATTA
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

October, 1977

Dear Local Advisory Council Member:

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education is conducting a study of members of local advisory councils (LACs) on vocational education established pursuant to Section 105(g)(1) of Public Law 94-482, Title II, as amended. These councils are also known as LEA Unit-Wide Occupational Education Advisory Committees. The purpose of the study is primarily to profile LAC members; however, we are also seeking their reactions to service on their local councils.

According to the records of the State Board of Education, you served as a member of a local advisory council on vocational education for a public school district for the FY 1978 local plan for vocational education. We would very much appreciate your helping us fulfill the purposes of our study by completing the enclosed survey form and returning it to us in the enclosed franked envelope. If you did not serve or have never served as an LAC member, please write "Not Applicable" at the top of the survey form and return it to us anyway.

Thank you very much for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Carolyn K. Samet

Carolyn K. Samet
Special Assistant

Enclosures

LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL SURVEY FORM

1. Please indicate below whether you serve as a local advisory council member for a public school district or a community college/technical institute:

   ____ public school district ____ community college/technical institute

2. What local official appointed you?

   ____ superintendent ____ director
   ____ principal ____ other _____ (please specify)

3. Please indicate below the area you represent on your local advisory council:

   ____ business ____ student
   ____ industry ____ other _____(specify)
   ____ labor ____ do not know

4. When were you appointed to your local advisory council? _____ Month/Day/Year

5. How often has your council met since you were appointed?

   ____ once ____ three times or more
   ____ twice ____ have not met

6. If your council has met at least once, how would you rate your participation in the meeting(s)?

   ____ very active ____ very passive
   ____ moderately active ____ was unable to attend meeting
   ____ moderately passive

7. How do you feel about your council's input to the local annual application sent to the State Board of Education?

   ____ Council advice was used to the fullest extent.
   ____ Council advice was well used but could have been better utilized.
   ____ Council advice was largely ignored.
   ____ Council advice was not requested.

8. Has your council met for purposes other than giving your local education agency advice on the annual application?

   ____ Yes ____ No

9. If yes, for what other purpose(s) has it met? _____

_____

_____

10. What do you think the role of your local advisory council should be in terms of advice to the local education agency other than the development of the annual application?

_____

_____

_____

11. Please check the appropriate response to the following statement: Our local education agency is meeting the training needs of area business and industry. [You may not exactly agree with any of the responses, but check the one that comes closest to what you think.]

____ strongly agree ____ disagree somewhat

____ agree somewhat ____ strongly disagree

12. Answer this question if you "agreed somewhat" or disagreed with the above statement: Do you think your local council can assist the local education agency in making training courses available more responsive to area industrial needs?

____ Yes ____ No

13. How do you think your council can assist the local education agency in making vocational education courses offered more responsive to area industrial needs?

_____

_____

_____

14. Are you aware that the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education usually conducts a Public Forum on issues in vocational education each February?

____ Yes ____ No

15. If yes, have you ever attended one of the Public Forum meetings?

____ Yes ____ No

/Please check the appropriate blanks below./

16. Your race:

____ White ____ American Indian

____ Black ____ Other _____ (please specify)

17. Your sex: ____ Male ____ Female

18. Your age: ____ Less than 18 ____ 46-55

____ 18-25 ____ 56-64

____ 26-35 ____ 65 and over

____ 36-45

THIS COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF REMARKS FROM RESPONDENTS

WHO SAID THE SURVEY WAS NOT APPLICABLE TO THEM

1. I don't think this applies to me since I am employed by (name) Technical Institute. It was _____ and myself who formed the local advisory board for public schools and our Institute.

2. Not applicable. I'm a director of vocational education.

3. Council has not met during the time I have been a member.

4. I have been invited to serve but I have not had the opportunity as yet.

5. Have just been appointed; attended no meetings yet.

6. I have been appointed to an ed. advisory council by the County Commissioner but we have not had a meeting as yet.

7. I have been selected to serve during FY 78; however, I have not no opportunity for input as of this date.

8. Not applicable. I did serve on a school committee but am not aware that it was in this context.

9. Not applicable. I served on the task force for occupational education in (name) Co. last year (76-77) and that is how my name got on your list.

10. Don't know anything about this Council.

11. I have never been notified of any appointment.

12. I was asked to serve on an advisory committee, but have never been notified of a meeting.

13. Not applicable because I have never been notified that I was LAC member.

14. As chairman of county board of comm. I may have been consulted but don't serve as member.

15. Did not serve.

16. I have been on the Advisory Council for the past year and have not heard anything about any meeting at my school.

NORTH CAROLINA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

P.O. Box 5312

Raleigh, North Carolina 27650

MEMBERSHIP 1978-79

Ezora G. Alligood (Mrs. Bennie T.)
Route 4, Box 360
Washington, NC 27889

Janet Sue Auten (Mrs. Frank O.)
617 Poplar Hill Ext.
Boone, NC 28607

* Robert M. Ball
415 Castle Hayne Road
Wilmington, NC 28401

William W. Calhoun
3959 Wendy Lane
Raleigh, NC 27606

N. E. Cannady, Jr.
12 Griffing Boulevard
Asheville, NC 28804

Glenn M. Colston (Mrs. Newton V)
P.O. Drawer 1009
Asheboro, NC 27203

Alton R. Davis
P.O. Box 248
Bladenboro, NC 28320

Sondra C. Davis (Mrs. Felton)
1109 W. Virginia Street
Mount Airy, NC 27030

Allen W. Fullwood
209 Hilltop Street
Morganton, NC 28655

Linda Habershaw (Mrs. Robert N.)
Route 1, Box 100
Roaring River, NC 28669

James Leutze
2133 North Lakeshore Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Nancy Logan (Mrs. William J.)
P.O. Box 40
Cedar Mountain, NC 28718

Rachel V. Malcolm (Mrs. James F.)
2810 St. Claire Road
Winston-Salem, NC 27106

Bobby C. McLamb
Route 6, Box 521
Fayetteville, NC 28301

Daphne D. O'Neal
Route 1, Box N17
Swan Quarter, NC 27885

Lauretta D. Parker (Mrs. Joseph M.)
310 Colony Avenue
Ahoskie, NC 27910

Gladys B. Slaughter
1805 Windsor Street
Wilson, NC 27893

Phillip H. Smith
Box 6, Cherokee Indian Agency
Cherokee, NC 28719

Margaret C. Stewart (Mrs. Edward P.)
P.O. Box 186
Oakboro, NC 28129

Myrtle D. Stogner (Mrs. William H.)
Box 628, Richmond County Schools
Rockingham, NC 28379

John K. Wooten, Jr.
301 N. Herman Street, Box GG
Goldsboro, NC 27530

.....

Dr. E. Michael Latta
Executive Director
Telephone: 919/737-2495

*Deceased